



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING BOARD

ROOM 304, WATERTOWN CITY HALL
245 WASHINGTON STREET
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380
(315) 785-7740

MEETING: June 7, 2016

PRESENT:

Larry Coburn, Chairperson
Linda Fields
Neil Katzman
Anthony Neddo
Steve Rowell
Michelle Capone

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning & Community
Development Director
Jeffrey Polkowski, Planner
Geoffrey Urda, Planner
Brian Drake, Civil Engineer II
Justin Wood, City Engineer

ABSENT:

None

The June 7, 2016 Planning Board Meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM by Planning Board Chair Larry Coburn. Mr. Coburn called for a reading of the Minutes from the May 3, 2016 Planning Board Meeting. Ms. Fields made a motion to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Katzman and all voted in favor.

ZONE CHANGE

EAST SECTION OF VL BELLEW AVENUE SOUTH – PARCEL # 9-11-133.110 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS to COMMERCIAL

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Bryan J. Donegan of I-Site Realty to change the approved zoning classification of the east section of VL Bellew Avenue South, Parcel Number 9-11-133.110 from Neighborhood Business to Commercial.

Mr. Donegan was in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Donegan began by saying that he had been in discussion with a doctor that was interested in developing the property. Mr. Donegan then said that the doctor did not want to purchase the property from I-Site Realty unless the zoning was changed. He added that to doctor was interested in building something similar to the existing dentist's office across the street.

Mr. Donegan then said that he was confused because the previous owner of this property operated a car dealership, which the Zoning Ordinance does not permit in a Neighborhood Business District.

Mr. Polkowski replied to the applicant and said that it was possible that the previous owner had a Special Use Permit to operate a car dealership. Mr. Urda added that it was

also possible that the parcel boundaries had changed in the intermittent time since the car dealership closed, which may have led to a split-zoned parcel.

Mr. Coburn then said that he wanted to address a SEQR concern identified in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board. Mr. Coburn said that the answers to Questions 10 and 11 needed to be changed and asked if Staff had received a modified Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF).

Mr. Urda replied that Staff had not yet received a revised EAF. Mr. Coburn explained to Mr. Donegan that these two questions dealt with water and sewer connections, and that all the Planning Board was considering today was a proposed zone change. He then advised the Mr. Donegan to submit a revised form.

Mr. Lumbis said that the applicant could submit a revised EAF anytime within the next week or so. Mr. Donegan asked if a digital copy would suffice or if Staff needed a hard copy. Mr. Urda replied that a hard copy was necessary because the applicant must sign the form.

Mr. Coburn then asked about Staff's comments in the memorandum that the applicant had not specified in his cover letter what he sought to accomplish with the requested zone change. Mr. Urda replied that Mr. Donegan had emailed Staff the previous day explaining his desire to sell the property to a doctor interested in developing the site. Mr. Urda added that this email would suffice to serve as the required written description of the request's purpose.

Ms. Fields then moved to recommend that City Council approve the zone change request submitted by Bryan J. Donegan of I-Site Realty to change the approved zoning classification of the east section of VL Bellew Avenue South, Parcel Number 9-11-133.110 from Neighborhood Business to Commercial.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Neddo and all voted in favor, except Ms. Capone who had not yet arrived at the meeting.

WAIVER OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL 118 MASSEY STREET NORTH – PARCEL # 7-04-109.000

The Planning Board then considered a request for a Waiver of Site Plan Approval submitted by Patsy A. Storino, LS on behalf of Kall & D'Argenio for the construction of a seven-space, 2,400 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 118 Massey Street North, Parcel Number 7-04-109.000.

Mr. Storino was in attendance to represent the project.

Mr. Storino began by saying that the applicant wished to install seven parking spaces, including one accessible space, and an accessibility ramp for the existing building. Mr. Storino then said that he proposed a six-foot-wide loading zone for the accessible space, but that the City Engineering Department insisted on an eight-foot-wide loading zone. Mr. Storino then

cited two examples of existing government parking lots in the City where the loading zones were only five feet in width.

Mr. Storino then addressed drainage concerns identified in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board. He noted that the slope of land on the site is very minimal and said that he had prepared a tentative drainage plan and proposed a catch basin at the lowest point on the site. He added that there was a County drain line in close proximity to the site's northeast property line, and that it was 12-inch PCP pipe.

Mr. Storino then said that there would be a wide green space on the other side of the northeast property line as well, and that the County would allow drainage onto that green space, and added that he could produce written permission for that.

Mr. Storino then said that he hoped that the Planning Board could waive the eight-foot width requirement for the loading zone for the accessible parking space and grant a conditional approval for his waiver request.

Mr. Katzman said that the City Planning Board did not have the authority to waive the required width of a loading zone, and said that he had seen the ADA threaten fines for non-compliance. Mr. Storino replied that he understood.

Mr. Coburn then asked about the summary items listed in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board. Mr. Polkowski said that the applicant had satisfied the first item on the list, which requested written documentation outlining the agreement with Jefferson County granting the applicant a right-of-way for vehicle access to the rear parking lot.

Mr. Katzman then said that the second summary item required the applicant to revise the plans to provide an Accessible Parking Space loading zone that meets State Building Code requirements of eight feet in width, and noted that the Planning Board could not authorize breaking the law.

Mr. Storino then addressed the third summary item, which required him to submit a copy of the right-of-way granted by Jefferson County for access to the parcel. He said that this was pending.

Mr. Storino then address the fourth summary item, which required the applicant to stripe all proposed parking spaces, and said that he would do this.

Mr. Storino then addressed the fifth summary item, which required the applicant to submit a grading plan to the City Engineering Department prior to paving any new blacktop, and said that he would do so.

Mr. Storino then addressed the six and seventh summary items, which required the applicant to identify the proposed hours of operation and provide site lighting if hours were proposed after sunset. Mr. Storino said the proposed hours were 8:30 am to 5 pm and that there was existing lighting on the rear of the building.

Mr. Storino then addressed the eighth summary item, which required a building permit for the proposed accessibility ramp, and acknowledged the need for the permit.

Mr. Storino then addressed the ninth summary item, which dealt with landscaping. Mr. Polkowski said that Mr. Storino could work with Staff to satisfy landscaping requirements.

Mr. Rowell then moved to approve the request for a Waiver of Site Plan Approval submitted by Patsy A. Storino, LS on behalf of Kall & D'Argenio for the construction of a seven-space, 2,400 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 118 Massey Street North, Parcel Number 7-04-109.000, contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall provide written documentation outlining the agreement with Jefferson County granting the applicant a right-of-way for vehicle access to the rear parking lot.
2. The applicant shall revise the plans to provide an Accessible Parking Space access aisle that meets State Building Code requirements of 8 feet in width.
3. The applicant shall submit a copy of the right-of-way granted by Jefferson County for access to the parcel.
4. The applicant shall provide striping for all parking spaces.
5. The applicant shall perform all grading such that drainage is not directed onto adjoining parcels. For verification, the applicant's contractor shall submit a grading plan to the City Engineering Department prior to paving any new blacktop.
6. The applicant shall indicate the proposed hours of operation.
7. The applicant shall provide lighting for the proposed parking lot expansion if there are any proposed hours of operation after sunset.
8. The applicant must obtain a building permit prior to constructing the handicapped accessibility ramp.
9. The applicant shall define "green space" in the submitted site plans and detail how he will meet the landscaping and buffer zone guidelines.

Ms. Fields seconded the motion and all voted in favor, except Ms. Capone, who had not yet arrived at the meeting.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL
1552 STATE STREET – PARCEL # 12-16-113.000

The Planning Board then considered a request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Edward G. Olley, AIA of GYMO, DPC on behalf of James Petersen of Fast Lube of Watertown for the construction of a ten-space, approximately 2,581 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 1552 State Street, Parcel Number 12-16-113.000. Mr. Olley and Mr. Petersen were in attendance to represent the project.

Mr. Olley began by saying that City Council had approved a zone change for the property on the previous evening, which extended Neighborhood Business zoning across the entire parcel and eliminated a previous split-zone with Residence B. He then said that there were a couple of other outstanding items related to the project, one of which was that he had not yet received correspondence from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the project's potential to impact any archeological resources.

Mr. Olley said that the other issue was that the property owner and the neighbor wished to relocate the proposed fence and landscaping from how it was shown on the submitted site plan. Mr. Olley said that Mr. Petersen's southern neighbor on Pearl Avenue South wanted the proposed fence to be on the northern side of the landscaped buffer, so that she could enjoy a view of the landscaping rather than having a view of a fence.

Mr. Olley also said that there were discussions that he needed to have with the City Engineering Department before he could obtain any permits. He then asked if the Planning Board could grant Site Plan Approval contingent upon receiving a reply from SHPO and upon submitting a revised plan to the Engineering Department. Mr. Olley added that the purpose of a contingent approval would be to grant the owner the latitude to perform the stormwater engineering that he needed to do.

Mr. Neddo then asked where the combined sewer was. Mr. Olley replied that it was on Pearl Avenue South, and added that the only sewer out there was combined. Mr. Olley said that stormwater currently leaves the site and goes into Pearl Avenue South. He further added that no new drainage was proposed but that no additional runoff was proposed for the site either beyond what had already been approved for it in the past.

Mr. Coburn then asked about the first summary item in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board, which required the applicant to prepare a vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan. Mr. Olley replied that he didn't see the need for one. Mr. Petersen then said that his site had no existing parking and said that what the site plan sought to accomplish was to create space for employee parking and snow storage. He said that the existing traffic arrows on the site guide customer vehicles around to the back of the building and out the front. He acknowledged that when employees leave, they are driving against the arrows as they exit, but it is the only way out.

Mr. Coburn reiterated that Staff was asking for a vehicular and pedestrian circulation plan. Mr. Olley replied that nothing would change from present movements. Mr. Drake then said that the existing site had the aforementioned painted arrows that guided all traffic to leave through the building. Mr. Drake added that if Mr. Petersen was requesting for a

two-way in/out driveway, then a circulation plan should show that. Mr. Olley replied that the painted arrows were only intended for customers.

Mr. Petersen then said that in 29 years, there has never been a problem on the site with vehicular conflicts, but said that if they put two-way arrows in, they would then have a melee because the arrows would make things more confusing. Mr. Drake replied that a vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan is something that the City asks for from every applicant. Mr. Olley then said that he would submit a plan if necessary.

Mr. Petersen then addressed the second summary item, which required an accessible parking space and an eight-foot loading zone and said that he would provide both.

Mr. Olley then addressed the third summary item, which required him to submit an accurate survey. Mr. Olley said that the previously submitted survey, which was dated 1992, represented the current conditions, had spot elevations and margins. Mr. Drake replied that the survey was performed prior to the State Street reconstruction project and that some of the upgrades completed as part of that project were not accurately depicted and some of the grades were questionable.

Mr. Coburn then said that he felt that tabling this application might be appropriate. Mr. Olley asked why a survey was required when all of the proposed work was on a side parcel. Mr. Drake replied that a requirement of any site plan application was an accurate survey and that the survey provided was not accurate. Mr. Coburn then noted that every summary item was generating disagreement.

Mr. Olley then asked if this project could qualify for a Waiver of Site Plan Approval. Mr. Urda replied that in order to be eligible for a waiver, the amount of pavement proposed must be reduced not to exceed 2,500 square feet. Mr. Drake added that drainage issues would still need to be resolved even if the project was changed to qualify for a waiver.

Mr. Coburn then reiterated that he felt tabling the application was the proper course of action. Ms. Capone then moved to table the request for Site Plan Approval submitted by Edward G. Olley, AIA of GYMO, DPC on behalf of James Petersen of Fast Lube of Watertown for the construction of a ten-space, approximately 2,581 square-foot parking lot and associated site improvements located at 1552 State Street, Parcel Number 12-16-113.000.

Ms. Fields seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL
830 WASHINGTON STREET AND THE 100 BLOCK OF WOODRUFF STREET –
PARCEL NUMBERS 14-02-101.110, 14-01-101.000, 14-01-102.000, 14-01-139.000,
14-01-112.000, 14-01-113.000 and 14-01-114.000

The Planning Board then considered a previously tabled request submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC on behalf of Samaritan Medical Center for the construction of a 17,900 square-foot, three-story building addition and 53-space parking lot, a 17,300 square-foot, two-story building addition and 62-space parking lot, a 33,600

square-foot parking lot and a 9,000 square-foot parking lot at 830 Washington Street and the 100 Block of Woodruff Street, Respective Parcel Numbers 14-02-101.110, 14-01-101.000, 14-01-102.000, 14-01-139.000, 14-01-112.000, 14-01-113.000 and 14-01-114.000.

Mr. Morgia and Chris Bastien of Samaritan Medical Center were in attendance to represent the project.

Mr. Morgia began by saying that his team had received Staff's review comments and had prepared responses for each summary item. He then distributed written copies of the draft responses to the Planning Board and to Staff.

Mr. Morgia then summarized the changes that were made to the application since it was tabled. He said that a center sewer had been shifted and that the connection is proposed within Woodruff Street. He said that crosswalks across Woodruff Street were now depicted as well. He then said that the Women's and Children's Center previously had biohazard storage areas proposed, and said that those had been shifted to another location where dumpsters were previously shown.

Mr. Morgia said that the remote water service connection had been relocated, and added that some investigations were ongoing as to how some of the connectivity would take place. He then said that all of these modifications left them one parking space short of the aggregate needed for the campus, so four spaces were added to the plans in the area of the center island in the Cancer Center lot.

Mr. Morgia then asked if there were any questions. Hearing no questions from the Planning Board, Mr. Coburn asked if Staff had any questions and Mr. Polkowski replied that Staff did not.

Ms. Fields then moved to recommend that City Council approve the request submitted by Matthew R. Morgia, P.E. of Aubertine and Currier, PLLC on behalf of Samaritan Medical Center for the construction of a 17,900 square-foot, three-story building addition and 53-space parking lot, a 17,300 square-foot, two-story building addition and 62-space parking lot, a 33,600 square-foot parking lot and a 9,000 square-foot parking lot at 830 Washington Street and the 100 Block of Woodruff Street, Respective Parcel Numbers 14-02-101.110, 14-01-101.000, 14-01-102.000, 14-01-139.000, 14-01-112.000, 14-01-113.000 and 14-01-114.000 contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant shall obtain Special Use Permit approval for the required remote parking areas.
2. The applicant shall indicate snow storage areas for the two remote parking areas on the site plans.
3. All existing and proposed curb ramps and sidewalks within the City margin shall be built to City specifications and shall meet the requirements of Public Right of Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG).

4. Applicant shall coordinate with the Engineering Dept. regarding the review and installation of the proposed crosswalks.
5. The Notice of Intent (NOI) shall be submitted to the NYSDEC and the NOI acknowledgement letter from the DEC shall be forwarded to the City upon receipt.
6. The property owner must obtain the following permits prior to construction: Demolition Permit, Building Permit, Fence Permit, Sidewalk Permit, General City Permit (to work within margin), Disconnect and Plug Permit (capping of existing sanitary), and Sanitary/Storm Sewer Connection Permit.
7. The applicant must assemble parcels 14-02-101.110, 14-01-102.000, 14-01-139.000 by way of a new metes and bounds description filed with the County Clerk.
8. The applicant must assemble parcels 14-01-112.000, 14-01-113.000, 14-01-114.000 by way of a new metes and bounds description filed with the County Clerk.
9. The applicant must coordinate with the City Fire Department for the location of required Knox Boxes.
10. Details and maintenance agreements for the upkeep of the Water Quality Unit and Underground Stormwater Detention systems shall be submitted to the City.

Mr. Neddo seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL
218 STONE STREET AND 123 MASSEY STREET SOUTH
PARCEL NUMBERS 10-02-101.000 and 10-02-113.000**

The Planning Board then considered a request submitted by Andrew M. Hart, RLA, ASLA, of Bergmann Associates Inc. on behalf of COR Arsenal Street Company, LLC for the construction of three 3-story, 36,402 square-foot residential buildings, two 2-story, 18,000 square-foot office buildings, a 5,588 square-foot community center, an interior parking lot and associated site improvements at 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 10-02-101.000, and 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000.

Mr. Hart, as well as Catherine Johnson of COR Development Company, LLC and Amy Dake of SRF & Associates were in attendance to represent the project.

Ms. Johnson began by saying that COR sought to redevelop the site of the old Mercy Hospital in a way that would better utilize the block and would create a new neighborhood. She said that each of the proposed residential buildings would be three stories and have 1-and-2-bedroom units, but no 3-bedroom units. She then said that the proposed community center will have a fitness center, library and community rooms, and will be shared with St. Patrick's Parish which is in dire need of gathering space.

Ms. Johnson then said that the proposed office buildings would be two stories, and that they potentially could host both retail and office uses with retail on the first floor and office on the second floor, but that there were no identifiable tenants at this point.

Ms. Johnson emphasized that the goal was to create a new neighborhood while working with the church to create improved traffic flow, parking and building layout. She said that they have been working with the church to reconfigure the property lines to make this happen and spoke to the need to subdivide and reassemble various parcels. She said the church will have the same amount of land that it does now, but it will be reconfigured and added that there will be reciprocal easements for the shared interior parking.

Ms. Johnson then said that all of the buildings except for the community center would require setback variances, and that her team had already submitted variance requests to the Zoning Board of Appeals. She said that the proposed office buildings were at a zero-foot setback and added that it was similar to what existed across the street and in many urban settings. She then said that Andrew Hart of Bergmann Associates was here and would address some of the comments in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board.

Mr. Hart said that the northwestern entrance to the site from Massey Street South was proposed to be an entrance only in response to a church request. He added that five driveways would access the site, one each from Arsenal, Sherman and Stone Streets respectively, and two from Massey Street South.

Mr. Hart then said that in terms of lighting, his team was proposing LED fixtures that were downcast. He added that at the center of the site, there was a small maintenance building proposed as well as enclosed dumpsters for the site, and emphasized that they tried to keep it all internal, pushing the buildings out like you would see in a typical urban setting and keep the parking hidden.

Mr. Hart then said that meeting stormwater and landscaping regulations would not be a problem and turned his attention to architecture. He said that the three proposed residential buildings would be brick with areas of vinyl cladding, which would be broken up into sections, and added that the proposed community center would have the same brick façade with vinyl cladding. He then referred to elevation drawings of the proposed office buildings, noting that they would have primarily brick exteriors. He then yielded the floor to Amy Dake.

Ms. Dake began by distributing a letter to the Planning Board members that she had written to COR Development Company summarizing SRF Associates' trip generation findings for the proposed site plan. Ms. Dake said that the analysis compared the proposal with the former Mercy Hospital. She said that SRF Associates projected 86 vehicles entering the site during the morning peak and 56 exiting, and for the evening peak, SRF's projections were 70 vehicles entering and 126 exiting the site.

Ms. Dake then said that when SRF does a traffic study, they typically study intersections where there will be an impact of 100 vehicles or more at those intersections. She said that no single intersection was expected to experience 100 trips or more as a result of the

proposed project. She added that SRF contacted the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), and NYSDOT said that they did not see the need for a traffic study, nor did they have jurisdiction over any of these roadways.

Ms. Dake then said that SRF did acknowledge the tendency for traffic to back up on Arsenal Street during peak times under existing conditions. She elaborated that because trip generation projections were relatively low, that was why DOT did not express concerns.

Mr. Coburn then asked about access to the site from its various sides. Ms. Dake identified the proposed access patterns on a large map of the site plan. Mr. Neddo asked about NYSDOT not having any comments. Ms. Dake replied that because NYSDOT did not have jurisdiction, they did not want to comment at all.

Mr. Drake then said that he wished to provide a little background. He said that he had spoken with NYSDOT about this proposal and they were surprised that the City was not requesting a traffic impact analysis, and that he told NYSDOT that the City was always planning to ask for one. Mr. Drake then said that the City Engineering Department had concerns about traffic in the area because of the impact of the north entrance into the site from Massey Street South, and would look for a traffic impact analysis to examine those concerns. He added that the City had nothing in writing regarding NYSDOT's stance and that it sounded like the applicant did not either.

Mr. Coburn then said that he could not imagine that anyone would be able to get in or out during the evening hours. Ms. Johnson replied that if a motorist couldn't get out onto Arsenal Street, they could exit the site somewhere else, and that most drivers would naturally choose the exit with the least traffic. She added that a traffic impact analysis would take time and would require traffic counts.

Ms. Johnson then emphasized that the problem with cars stacking on Arsenal Street already exists and asked what the Planning Board expected COR to do to solve that problem. She said that this project was not creating the problem, and this project was not making the problem worse either, and that if the Planning Board wanted another lane on Arsenal Street, then this project would not happen. Ms. Johnson then added that her team could produce a traffic impact analysis for the City, but that it would say that less than 100 trips were being added to each intersection.

Mr. Coburn then said that the Planning Board knew that the problem already existed, but that COR could not say that by adding all those cars with all those apartments and businesses, that they were not adding to it. Ms. Johnson replied that the City previously had a hospital there, which had been torn down, and that this project was putting back similar amounts of traffic to the hospital and not making the problem worse. Ms. Dake added that one thing that no one was considering was that this site was in the middle of the City, so transit usage and walking were ways to access the site without driving.

Mr. Katzman said that the majority of the people that used Mercy Hospital parked across Stone Street. He then said that you can put anything on paper, but in reality, once one car gets backed up, another car gets backed up and then Arsenal Street could be backed up to Public

Square. He said that there was a lot to consider that hadn't been taken into account, and that he did not feel that what the applicant's team had said regarding traffic made anything better for the residents of the City.

Ms. Fields then said that what the applicants were doing was improving the City, and that for the additional traffic that would be generated, what the applicants were proposing to do was fantastic. She added that for the Planning Board to tell them to create something else did not make any sense and that she thought it was a great project.

Mr. Drake then said that the City was not insinuating that an extra lane be added to any street as a part of this project, but that the results of a traffic impact analysis might propose a way to better organize the proposed driveways and improve traffic flow. He said that one of the Engineering Department's main concerns was motorists attempting to make a left turn into the site from Massey Street South backing up intersections. Mr. Drake added that the existing driveway from Massey Street South is presently only used on Sundays, and that the project was creating an issue by using that driveway during peak hours.

Mr. Drake then said that restricting left turns into the site from the westbound lanes of Arsenal Street would help to avoid a negative impact on Public Square. Ms. Dake replied that all access from the east would then need to be from Stone Street and Sherman Street. Mr. Drake reiterated that the City Engineering Department felt that there were issues accessing the site.

Ms. Capone asked if those issues were severe enough to require a traffic impact analysis. Mr. Drake replied in the affirmative. Ms. Dake then hypothesized that the same people day in and day out would be entering and leaving the site, and that they would figure out the best ways in and out. Ms. Johnson then emphasized that performing a traffic impact analysis would take time and money. Mr. Drake replied that the City Engineering Department had been talking about these issues for some time with the applicant's design team and they have yet to be addressed.

Mr. Rowell then said that guiding more traffic towards Stone Street and Sherman Street was a better outcome and asked about the possibility of having two access points from either of those streets. Ms. Johnson replied that St. Patrick's Parish had to be a part of such a discussion also, and that any subsequent decisions about access points must be made in conjunction with the church.

Ms. Capone then said that guiding more traffic onto Sherman Street and Stone Street would create other effects and that the City would have to account for changing traffic patterns. Mr. Drake replied that Ms. Dake has performed analyses like the one the City was requesting all the time. Mr. Drake said that she will prove to the City and sell to the City on the position that this is the best configuration for the site.

Mr. Coburn then said that the applicant's team should go through the summary items in Staff's memorandum to the Planning Board, and asked about the first summary item, which required a letter from St. Patrick's Parish authorizing the applicant to apply for Site Plan

Approval on behalf of the church. Mr. Urda replied that Staff had received the required letter from St. Patrick's the previous day.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the second summary item, which required the applicant to apply for subdivision approval and file deeds for the subsequent assemblages with the County Clerk. She said that she understood and accepted this as a condition of Site Plan Approval, but said that COR would not want to spend the money and paper on applying for subdivisions until COR was confident that Site Plan Approval would be granted, and that other concerns raised earlier would not get in the way of the final site layout.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the third summary item, which required the applicant to remove three parking spaces from the site plan that were too close to Massey Street South and provide a landscaped buffer in their place, and said that she agreed with this condition.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the fourth summary item, which required a traffic impact analysis, and said that her team would fulfill this requirement.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the fifth summary item which required the applicant to forward NYSDOT's response to the analysis to the City Engineering Department, and she said that her team would do so.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the sixth and seventh summary items, which required the applicant to provide a vehicle and pedestrian circulation plan and to add traffic arrows to indicate traffic flow, and she said that her team would do both.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the eighth summary item, which required that the north entrance to the site from Massey Street South to be either a Right-in, Right-out or a Right-out only. Ms. Johnson said that she could not agree to that on behalf of St. Patrick's and asked how firm the Engineering Department was on this condition. Mr. Drake replied that the Engineering Department's standpoint was pretty firm. Ms. Johnson said that she would bring this issue to the church, but that if the church said no, she was not sure what would happen next.

Ms. Johnson then addressed the ninth summary item, which required several revisions to the SEQR Full EAF. Ms. Johnson said that she had revised SEQR forms prepared and then handed them to Staff.

Ms. Johnson then said that her team had no issues with any of the remaining summary items and said that they would fulfill all of the remaining identified requirements.

Mr. Polkowski then said that because the applicant was seeking two variances for the site plan, as proposed, that obtaining those variances should be added as a summary item.

It was then noted that the project requires review by the Jefferson County Planning Board. Mr. Urda noted that a copy of the application had been referred to the Jefferson County. Mr. Drake noted that the any changes to the site plan may affect the County's review and may require the City to resubmit the revised plans to the County. Michael Bourcy, Acting Planning Director for Jefferson County was in attendance and addressed the Planning Board

regarding this issue. Mr. Bourcy noted that if there were minor changes to the site plan, a second referral to the County would probably not be necessary. He said, however, that if there were major material changes to the site plan, then it is likely that the County Planning Board would want to review the site plan further.

Mr. Coburn then said that it would be appropriate to table this application until everything is addressed, but that a special meeting is possible to expedite the approval process if need be. Ms. Johnson agreed that tabling the application was the best course of action, and asked if the application would stay on the table until the Planning Board took it back up or if it would automatically appear on the next month's agenda. Mr. Lumbis replied that if her team submitted any revised plans or additional materials, they would be on the next agenda.

Ms. Johnson then asked about how large a scope would be expected of a traffic study. Mr. Coburn replied that she would need to work with Staff on that.

Ms. Fields then moved to table the request submitted by Andrew M. Hart, RLA, ASLA, of Bergmann Associates Inc. on behalf of COR Arsenal Street Company, LLC for the construction of three 3-story, 36,402 square-foot residential buildings, two 2-story, 18,000 square-foot office buildings, a 5,588 square-foot community center, an interior parking lot and associated site improvements at 218 Stone Street, Parcel Number 10-02-101.000, and 123 Massey Street South, Parcel Number 10-02-113.000.

Mr. Coburn seconded the motion and all voted in favor, except Ms. Capone who abstained.

Ms. Fields then moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neddo and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 PM.